

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 23, 2008. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 4-12 were pending in this Application. Claims 4-12 were rejected. Claims 1-3 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 7, and 10 to remove clarify the scope of those claims in the context of Applicant's present disclosure. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-12 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,014,135 issued to Antonio M. Fernandes ("*Fernandes*"). Applicant respectfully traverses and submits the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art as anticipated by the Examiner cannot anticipate the rejected Claims, because the cited art does not show all the elements of the present Claims.

The sole reference cited by the Examiner, *Fernandes*, fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's claims, as presented. For example, *Fernandes* fails to teach at least the following features of independent Claim 4:

generating an object processing platform by moving an object
from a display belonging to the object computer to an
interaction area of a display belonging to the processing
computer . . .

Specifically, *Fernandes* fails to teach *moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer.*

As an example, Applicant's present disclosure illustrates the interaction of two computers UC1 and UC2 in FIG. 5 and at paragraphs 31–32 and the interaction of two displays in FIGS. 6–8 and at paragraphs 35–39. As a specific example, Applicant's present disclosure describes one usage scenario in reference to FIG. 8:

In FIG. 8, the user transfers an object from the PDA (belongs to the display 1) to the PC (belongs to the display 2). An object of this kind may be a file, an image or, for example, a clipboard.

In this non-limiting example, it is clear that a transfer from a first computer (the PDA) to a second computer (the PC) is effectuated by interacting with a first display (display 1) and a second display (display 2).

In support of the rejection of independent Claim 4, the Examiner cites to *Fernandes*. *Fernandes* discusses an online collaboration site, i.e., groupware, enabling access by multiple users to the same hosted documents. The cited passage is:

ROUTING

Once a document has been created and it is stored, a second icon 42 is displayed on the display 50. To route the created or stored document, such as document 42A to a desired individual, the user simply clicks or activates the desired second icon or document 42A through the use of the mouse 20. The document 42A is then dragged and super-positioned over the desired first icon 40, representative of the individual to whom the document is to be routed. Referring to FIG. 6 there is shown the display 50 showing the result of moving a document to a desired individual.

Similar to the screen 50 shown in FIG. 5 wherein for each individual there is associated the available media for communication, the display 50 shown in FIG. 6 also shows that the individual has an attribute of the delivery defined therewith. The attribute of delivery includes urgent and normal modes of delivery. Unlike the method of the prior art, however, wherein the attributes of urgent and normal modes of delivery are defined by the program that created the document or is to deliver the document, in the present invention, the attributes are defined by the individual to whom the document is to be delivered. Thus, the definition of "urgent" is specified by the individual to whom the document is to be routed. The user does not have to and in fact does not know how urgent the individual to whom the document is to be routed desires the

document to be urgent format. All the user knows is that if the user believes that it is urgent, the routing thereof would be in the fastest manner specified by the individual to whom the document is intended to be routed.

Fernandes, col. 11, ll.34–63. As can be seen from this passage, *Fernandes* discusses the creation of a file by one individual and the routing of that file to another individual within a groupware environment. This allows the recipient to log in to the groupware system and see the newly created and routed file.

However, *Fernandes* does not discuss *moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer*. Simply put, *Fernandes* does not discuss the existence or interaction of two displays, each of which is associated with a different computer.

For at least these reasons, independent Claim 4 is allowable over *Fernandes*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 4, as well as Claims 5–6 that depend from Claim 4.

In another example, *Fernandes* fails to teach at least the following features of independent Claim 7:

wherein the object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer . . .

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 4, *Fernandes* fails to teach *moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 7, as well as Claims 8 and 9 that depend from Claim 7.

In another example, *Fernandes* fails to teach at least the following features of independent Claim 10:

wherein an object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer . . .

For at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claim 4, *Fernandes* fails to teach *moving an object from a **display belonging to the object computer** to an interaction area of a **display belonging to the processing computer***. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 10, as well as Claims 11 and 12 that depend from Claim 7.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed because the *Fernandes* does not teach all limitations of the independent claims. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are allowable at least to the extent of the independent claim to which they refer, respectively. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the dependent claims. Applicant reserves the right to make further arguments regarding the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicant respectfully submits a Petition for One-Month Extension of Time. The Commissioner is authorized to charge the fee of \$130.00 required to Deposit Account 50-4871 in order to effectuate this filing.

Applicant believes there are no other fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4871 of King & Spalding LLP.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicant's attorney at 512.457.2030.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING LLP
Attorney for Applicant



Eric M. Grabski
Reg. No. 51,749

Date: April 23, 2009

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
KING & SPALDING LLP
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **86528**
512.457.2030
512.457.2100 (fax)